# Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of	)
Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service	) CC Docket No. 96-45
NPCR, Inc. d/b/a Nextel Partners	) ) DA 04-2667
Petition for Designation as an	)
Eligible Telecommunications Carrier	)
in the State of Alabama	)
Petition for Designation as an	)
Eligible Telecommunications Carrier	)
in the State of Florida	)
Petition for Designation as an	)
Eligible Telecommunications Carrier	)
in the State of Georgia	)
Petition for Designation as an	)
Eligible Telecommunications Carrier	)
in the State of New York	)
Petition for Designation as an	)
Eligible Telecommunications Carrier	)
in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	)
Petition for Designation as an	)
Eligible Telecommunications Carrier	)
in the State of Tennessee	)
Petition for Designation as an	)
Eligible Telecommunications Carrier	)
in the Commonwealth of Virginia	)

# SUPPORTING COMMENTS of the ORGANIZATION FOR THE PROMOTION AND ADVANCEMENT OF SMALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPANIES

#### I. INTRODUCTION

The Organization for the Promotion and Advancement of Small

Telecommunications Companies (OPASTCO) hereby submits these comments in support
of the Application for Review filed by the Rural Local Exchange Carriers (RLECs)<sup>1</sup>
regarding the designation of NPCR, Inc. d/b/a Nextel Partners (Nextel) as an eligible
telecommunications carrier (ETC) in various states.<sup>2</sup> OPASTCO is a national trade
association representing over 560 small incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs)
serving rural areas of the United States. Its members, which include both commercial
companies and cooperatives, together serve over 3.5 million customers. All of
OPASTCO's members are rural telephone companies as defined in 47 U.S.C. §153(37).

#### II. COMMENTS

On February 27, 2004, the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service (Joint Board) released a *Recommended Decision*, that proposes to limit support to primary lines and to adopt federal guidelines for the designation of ETCs.<sup>3</sup> Shortly thereafter, the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, seeking comment on this *Recommended Decision*.<sup>4</sup> Most recently, the Joint Board released a Public Notice seeking comment on issues related to the rural high-cost support mechanism to succeed

OPASTCO Comments 2 CC Docket No. 96-45
October 12, 2004 DA 04-2667

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Application for Review of the Rural Local Exchange Carriers, CC Docket No. 96-45 (filed Sept. 24, 2004) (RLECs' Application).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, NPCR, Inc. d/b/a Nextel Partners Petitions for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia, CC Docket No. 96-45, Order, DA 04-2667 (rel. Aug. 25, 2004).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45, Recommended Decision, 19 FCC Rcd 4257 (2004).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 19 FCC Rcd 10800 (2004).

the five-year framework approved in the Rural Task Force Order.<sup>5</sup> It is quite possible that, as a result of these proceedings, there will be some changes in the way in which competitive ETCs are designated, and in the level of support that they receive.<sup>6</sup>

Consequently, the Rural LECs are correct in urging that all seven of the Nextel ETC designations recently approved by the Wireline Competition Bureau should be reversed by the Commission. Additionally, the Bureau should be directed to defer consideration of the Nextel ETC Petitions, as well as other pending petitions for ETC designation in rural service areas, until after the Commission completes the proceedings that are considering changes to the rules relating to rural high-cost support and the process for designating ETCs.

In comments filed on the various ETC petitions, numerous parties have recommended that until the issues being considered in the universal service proceedings are resolved, the Commission should stay the approval of additional ETC applications.<sup>7</sup> OPASTCO agrees with these commenters, as well as with arguments made by the Rural LECs, that the public interest would be best served by preventing the USF from growing out of control at the same time that key policies related to universal service support levels

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service Seeks Comment on Certain of the Commission's Rules Relating to High-Cost Universal Service Support, CC Docket No. 96-45, Public Notice, FCC 04-J-2 (rel. Aug. 16, 2004).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See, RLECs Application, p. 5. See also, Citizens Telecommunications Company of New York (Citizens) Comments in CC Docket No. 96-45 (filed June 21, 2004), p. 13.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See, Citizens Comments, pp. 13-14; Comments of the New Hampshire Rural Carrier Group (NH LECs) in CC Docket No. 96-45 (filed June 21, 2004), pp. 3-4; Comments of New York State Telecommunications Association, Inc. in CC Docket No. 96-45 (filed June 21, 2004), pp. 12-13; Comments of NTELOS Telephone Companies in CC Docket No. 96-45 (filed June 21, 2004), p. 3; Comments of TDS Telecommunications Corp. (TDS) in CC Docket No. 96-45 (filed June 21, 2004), pp. 2-7; Comments of Verizon in CC Docket No. 96-45 (filed June 21, 2004), pp. 2, 6-7. (The NH LECs filed identical comments for both of the ETC applications filed in their state. Similarly, TDS filed identical comments in response to each of the ETC applications for the states of Florida, New Hampshire, and Virginia.)

and ETC designations are currently under review.<sup>8</sup> Thus, reversing the Bureau's approval of the recent Nextel ETC designations, and staying the review of these and other pending ETC applications, would be a prudent way to address the rapid growth of the Fund, until these portability issues are resolved.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See, RLECs Application, pp. 7-8. In its white paper *Universal Service in Rural America: A Congressional Mandate at Risk*, OPASTCO estimated that if all CMRS providers nationwide were to apply for and receive ETC status, the annual funding level of the High-Cost program would increase by approximately \$2 billion. This would seriously compromise the continued ability of the High-Cost program to ensure the provision of affordable and "reasonably comparable" services and rates to consumers in the most remote regions of the nation. *See*, Stuart Polikoff, *Universal Service in Rural America: A Congressional Mandate at Risk*, OPASTCO (January 2003), p. 21.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> There is a related precedent for staying the approval of additional ETC applications. In order to moderate the Fund's growth during its pending Part 36 USF rulemaking proceeding, the Commission imposed an interim cap on USF support for local exchange carriers from January 1, 1994 until January 1, 1996. *See, Amendment of Part 36 of the Commission's Rules and Establishment of a Joint Board,* CC Docket No. 80-286, Report and Order, 9 FCC Rcd 303 (1993), Erratum (1993). After an initial extension, the interim cap was further extended until May 8, 1997, so as to facilitate the transition to the new universal service rules that were adopted at that time. *See, Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service,* CC Docket No. 96-45, Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 7920 (1996).

### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all seven Nextel ETC designations identified in the RLECs' Application should be reversed and stayed pending the resolution of the proceedings that are considering changes to the calculation of high-cost support for competitive ETCs and the development of policy guidelines for the review of ETC applications.

Respectfully submitted,

THE ORGANIZATION FOR THE PROMOTION AND ADVANCEMENT OF SMALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPANIES

By: /s/ Stuart Polikoff	By: /s/ Jeffrey W. Smith
Stuart Polikoff	Jeffrey W. Smith
Director of Government Relations	Policy Analyst

OPASTCO 21 Dupont Circle NW Suite 700 Washington, DC 20036

(202)659-5990

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Jeffrey W. Smith, hereby certify that a copy of the comments by the Organization for the Promotion and Advancement of Small Telecommunications Companies was sent by first class United States mail, postage prepaid, on this, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2004, to those listed on the attached list.

By: <u>/s/ Jeffrey W. Smith</u> Jeffrey W. Smith

### SERVICE LIST

### CC Docket No. 96-45 DA 04-2667

Sheryl Todd
Telecommunications Access
Policy Division
Wireline Competition Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW
Room 5-B540
Washington, D.C. 20554

Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner and Chair Joint Board on Universal Service Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-B115 Washington, D.C. 20554

Kevin J. Martin, Commissioner Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-A204 Washington, D.C. 20554

Michael J. Copps, Commissioner Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-A302 Washington, D.C. 20554

Jonathan Adelstein, Commissioner Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-C302 Washington, D.C. 20554 Bob Rowe, Commissioner Montana Public Service Commission 1701 Prospect Avenue P.O. Box 202601 Helena, MT 59620-2601

Nanette G. Thompson, Chair Regulatory Commission of Alaska 1016 West Sixth Avenue, Suite 400 Anchorage, AK 99501-1693

Chairman Michael Powell Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-B201 Washington, D.C. 20554

Lila A. Jaber, Commissioner Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Gerald Gunter Building Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

J. Thomas Dunleavy, Commissioner New York Public Service Commission Three Empire State Plaza Albany, NY 12223-1350 Robert Nelson Commissioner Michigan Public Service Commission 6545 Mercantile Way Lansing, Michigan 48911

Greg Fogleman, Economic Analyst Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Gerald Gunter Building Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Mary E. Newmeyer, Federal Affairs Advisor Alabama Public Service Commission 100 N. Union Street, Suite 800 Montgomery, AL 36104

Joel Shifman, Senior Advisor Maine Public Utilities Commission 242 State Street State House Station 18 Augusta, ME 04333-0018

Peter Bluhm, Director of Policy Research Vermont Public Service Board Drawer 20 112 State Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Montpelier, VT 05620-2701

Charlie Bolle, Policy Advisor Nevada Public Utilities Commission 1150 E. Williams Street Carson City, NV 89701-3105 Peter Pescosolido, Chief, Telecom & Cable Division State of Connecticut Dept. of Public Utility Control 10 Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051

Jeff Pursley Nebraska Public Service Commission 300 The Atrium, 1200 N. Street P.O. Box 94927 Lincoln, NE 68509-4927

Larry Stevens, Utility Specialist Iowa Utilities Board 350 Maple Street Des Moines, IA 50319

Carl Johnson, Telecom Policy Analyst New York Public Service Commission 3 Empire State Plaza Albany, NY 12223-1350

Lori Kenyon, Common Carrier Specialist Regulatory Commission of Alaska 1016 West Sixth Avenue, Suite 400 Anchorage, AK 99501-1693

Jennifer Gilmore, Principal Telecommunications Analyst Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission Indiana Government Center South 302 West Washington Street, Suite E306 Indianapolis, ID 46204 Michael Lee, Technical Advisor Montana Public Service Commission 1701 Prospect Avenue P.O. Box 202601 Helena, MT 59620-2601

Billy Jack Gregg Consumer Advocate Division Public Service Commission of West Virginia 723 Kanawha Boulevard, East 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Union Building Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Philip McClelland Assistant Consumer Advocate Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate 555 Walnut Street Forum Place, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923

Barbara Meisenheimer, Consumer Advocate Missouri Office of Public Counsel 301 West High Street, Suite 250 Truman Building P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Earl Poucher, Legislative Analyst Office of the Public Counsel State of Florida 111 West Madison, Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400 Brad Ramsay, General Counsel NARUC 1101 Vermont Avenue, N.W. Suite 200 Washington, D.C. 20005

David Dowds, Public Utilities Supervisor Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Gerald Gunter Building Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Matthew Brill, Legal Advisor Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-B115 Washington, D.C. 20554

Daniel Gonzalez, Senior Legal Advisor Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-A204 Washington, D.C. 20554

Scott Bergmann, Legal Advisor Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-C302 Washington, D.C. 20554

Carol Mattey, Deputy Bureau Chief Federal Communications Commission Wireline Competition Bureau 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-C451 Washington, D.C. 20554 Jason Williams, Special Assistant Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-A204 Washington, D.C. 20554

Sharon Webber, Deputy Division Chief Federal Communications Commission WCB, Telecommunications Access Policy Division 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A425 Washington, D.C. 20554

Eric Einhorn, Division Chief Federal Communications Commission WCB, Telecommunications Access Policy Division 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A426 Washington, D.C. 20554

Anita Cheng, Assistant Division Chief Federal Communications Commission WCB, Telecommunications Access Policy Division 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A445 Washington, D.C. 20554

Katie King, Attorney Federal Communications Commission WCB, Telecommunications Access Policy Division 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-B544 Washington, D.C. 20554 Dana Walton-Bradford, Attorney Federal Communications Commission WCB, Telecommunications Access Policy Division 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A314 Washington, D.C. 20554

Paul Garnett, Attorney Federal Communications Commission WCB, Telecommunications Access Policy Division 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-C433 Washington, D.C. 20554

Shannon Lipp, Attorney Federal Communications Commission WCB, Telecommunications Access Policy Division 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A523 Washington, D.C. 20554

Geoff Waldau, Economist Federal Communications Commission WCB, Telecommunications Access Policy Division 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-B524 Washington, D.C. 20554

William Scher, Assistant Division Chief Federal Communications Commission WCB, Telecommunications Access Policy Division 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-B550 Washington, D.C. 20554 Diane Law Hsu, Deputy Division Chief Federal Communications Commission WCB, Telecommunications Access Policy Division 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 6-A360 Washington, D.C. 20554

Jennifer Schneider Attorney Federal Communications Commission WCB, Telecommunications Access Policy Division 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-C315 Washington, D.C. 20554

Vickie Robinson Attorney Federal Communications Commission WCB, Telecommunications Access Policy Division 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-B552 Washington, D.C. 20554

Gerard Waldron Mary Williams Covington & Burling Counsel to TDS Corp. 1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20004

Mark Wilkerson Leah Stephens Wilkerson & Bryan, PC Counsel to the Alabama Rural LECs 405 South Hull Street Montgomery, Alabama 36104 Albert Catalano Matthew Plache Ronald Jarvis Catalano & Plache PLLC Counsel for Nextel Partners 3221 M Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20007

Best Copy & Printing, Inc. Portals II 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W. Room CY-B402 Washington, D.C. 20554